DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 073 SP 037 863

AUTHOR Hinkle, Dennis E.; Proffitt, Thomas D.; Pilato, Virginia H.; Rosenthal, Michael

TITLE Shaping Educational Policy in Maryland: Teacher Education Reform and Beyond.

PUB DATE 1998-03-15
NOTE 11p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Partnerships in Education; Policy Formation; *Preservice Teacher Education; Public Education; Reading Instruction; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland; *State Policy

ABSTRACT

Maryland's teacher education reform began in 1991, when the Maryland Higher Education Council (MHEC) charged a task force with recommending a comprehensive approach to educating teachers that combined a solid foundation in academic preparation with promising developments in professional practice. The task force report recommended a 4+1 model for initial teacher preparation that had all teacher candidates complete a baccalaureate program with a major in a specific discipline followed by a 1-year internship. MHEC then directed the Secretary of Higher Education to develop a strategy for implementing the report's recommendations. A steering committee was developed that involved public schools, colleges, business, government, and the community in five design teams. There was considerable debate about the 4+1 approach. The committee created a report with 21 recommendations. Of utmost importance to them was recognizing the need for a solid foundation in academic disciplines for preservice teachers and for multiple paths to teacher certification. In 1995-1996, the recommendations began to be implemented. A redesigned teacher education program approval process linked to the recommendations began. Other initiatives that have grown out of the recommendations include: the State Teacher Education Council; Teacher Candidate Assessment Task Force; Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning in K-16; NCATE-Maryland State Partnership; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future; and State Task Force on Reading. The paper examines major implications at the school, college, and state level of these interlocking initiatives. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 418 073

Shaping Educational Policy in Maryland: Teacher Education Reform and Beyond.

Dennis E. Hinkle, Dean
Towson University

Thomas D. Proffitt, Associate Dean
Towson University

Virginia H. Pilato, Chief
Program Approval and Assessment
Maryland State Department of Education

Michael Rosenthal, Deputy Secretary
Maryland Higher Education Commission

D. Hinkle

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Higher education, in general, and teacher education, specifically, have been inundated with new and pressing calls for institutional and program reform and accountability. State, regional, and national commissions; journal articles; educational organizations and associations; and state legislatures and agencies have asserted the need for colleges and universities, and their teacher education programs, to provide extensive documentation of program reform, linkages to K-12, and acceptable measures of what they do and how well they do it. Beginning with the Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983 - A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform) and continuing through the Report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996 - What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future), the message remains clear. There is a lack of confidence in the responsiveness of higher education, and specifically teacher education, which has led state officials to legislate reforms, such as:

- strengthening the general education requirements in teacher education;
- developing five-year programs leading to initial certification;
- developing alternative routes to certification for liberal arts graduates and career changers;
- developing field-based programs operating within a school district; and
- developing performance based standards and assessments for initial and advanced certification.

Phase I - Teacher Education Redesign - 1991-92

In the State of Maryland, the reform initiative began in the Fall of 1991 (Phase I) when the Maryland Higher Education Council (MHEC) appointed a Blue Ribbon Task Force and charged it with recommending a comprehensive approach to the education of teachers which combines a solid foundation in academic preparation with the most

SP037863

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

promising developments in professional practice. After extensive discussion and debate, including the review of national and state reform efforts, the Phase I Task Force issued its report (1992 - MHEC: Investing in Teachers: Professional Preparation for the 21st Century) which contained a set of objectives for the redesign of teacher education; these objectives were:

- to enhance the liberal arts and sciences preparation of teacher candidates;
- to enhance the clinical, school-based experience;
- to institute outcomes-based instruction and assessment of teacher preparation;
- to integrate teacher reform with school reform;
- to integrate college-based faculty into the clinical setting;
- to involve the total campus community in the preparation of teachers; and
- to create a professional development ladder for future teachers.

The Phase I Task Force recommended a *4+1* model for initial teacher preparation. This model would have all teacher candidates complete a baccalaureate program with a major in a specific discipline followed by a one-year internship. While there was little, if any, concern expressed about the above set of objectives for the redesign of teacher education, the *single model* approach became very controversial.

Phase II - Teacher Education Redesign - 1993-95

Following the acceptance of the Phase I Task Force Report, MHEC directed the Secretary of Higher Education to develop a strategy for implementing the recommendations contained in the report. As an initial step, the Secretary invited the State Superintendent of Schools to co-sponsor Phase II of the process. Thus, the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) became a joint partner in the reform initiative. In the Fall of 1993, a Steering Committee was established and five Design Teams organized (1-Undergraduate programming; 2-Pre-internship assessment; 3-Professional development experience; 4-Post-internship assessment; and 5-Continuous professional development). Over 120 representatives from public schools, colleges and universities, business, government, and the community served on the various Design Teams and on the Steering Committee.

In the beginning stages of Phase II, the *4+1* model for initial teacher preparation continued to be the focus of concern. This single model approach continued to raise substantial concerns within the membership of all five design teams. In addition, other concerns related to this single model were raised :

- undergraduate majors/interdisciplinary majors;
- integration of subject matter content and professional pedagogy;
- early, sequential, and substantial field experiences;
- nature of the extended internship;
- role of the state and the role of the colleges/universities in the redesign;
- expectations for teacher candidates and program assessment;

- cost of implementing the redesign; and
- certification reciprocity among states.

As expected, there was considerable and substantial debate and discussion within the Phase II Design Teams and the Steering Committee. In contrast to the debates and discussions in Phase I, there was a broader representation of stakeholders involved as well as a clear expectation that the recommendations to be contained in the Phase II Final Report would become state policy. Therefore, due to the high stakes, representatives from the colleges and universities were active participants in the process and played key roles in shaping this policy agenda.

The Phase II Report (1995-MHEC: Teacher Education Task Force Report) contained 21 recommendations related to the following areas:

- appropriate undergraduate and post baccalaureate preparation;
- performance based teacher education programs;
- admission to the professional development experience;
- an extensive clinical experience;
- a comprehensive monitoring and assessment process; and
- a support system for continuing growth and development of novice and experienced teachers.

Of utmost importance to the stakeholders in the colleges and universities was the recognition of the need for a solid foundation in the academic disciplines for prospective teachers. Also, there was a clear recognition of the need for multiple paths to teacher certification for those who commit to a career in teaching during their pre-baccalaureate experience *(early deciders)*, those who decide to pursue a teaching career shortly after completing an undergraduate degree, and those individuals with a degree who desire to make a career change into teaching *(later deciders)*.

During the 1995-96 academic year, the implementation of the Phase II recommendations began. MSDE implemented a redesigned program approval process that was linked to the Phase II recommendations. Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education going through the MSDE Program Review process are now required to document initial efforts toward implementing the recommendations and to demonstrate the capacity and the strategy for full implementation by the year 2000. Evidence in the following areas must be documented:

- strong academic preparation, particularly in mathematics, science, and technology;
- extended internships in pre-K-12 schools, particularly in professional development schools;
- performance assessment of teacher candidates; and
- linkage with Maryland's school reform initiatives.

Colleges and universities in the state, in collaboration with local school districts, have begun to establish professional development schools. Funding from MHEC, as well as a U.S. Department of Education Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Grant and a U.S. Department of Labor Career Connections Grant, supports PDS sites in several locations throughout the states. Thirteen sites have received this state administered funding from these resources and participate in a statewide professional development school network. Both higher education institutions and local school districts have begun to reallocate internal funds in order to establish these initial sites and additional sites while determining institutional structures for sustaining them. Beyond the state-sponsored PDS sites, other sites are beginning to emerge through the use of these reallocated funds.

Other statewide initiatives impacting the MHEC-Redesign - 1995 -

In addition to the program review process, there are several significant, interlocking initiatives that have grown out of the Phase II Report and have the potential to further impact the policy agenda relating to the reform of teacher education; a short description of these follow.

State Teacher Education Council -- The State Teacher Education Council (STEC) is an advisory council to the State Superintendent of Education; its membership includes faculty and administrators from P-12, faculty and administrators from higher education, and representatives from teacher associations, state department of education, and the state council for higher education. During the 1995-96 and 1996-97 school years, STEC conducted a study of eleven (11) professional development school (PDS) projects and the Maryland PDS Network; these projects and the network were funded partially through grants from the USDE Eisenhower professional development grant program and a State of Maryland grant program.

Several conclusions and recommendations were made as the result of the study:

- given that PDS sites and networks are the cornerstone of the MHEC-Redesign, both MSDE and MHEC should encourage colleges/universities and school districts to develop multiple models for PDSs as well as to implement all tenets inherent in the Redesign and to maintain the momentum begun by the Redesign;
- given that state and federal monies were expended to develop the various PDS models, and that these expenditures resulted in substantive implementation of the PDS models, STEC should encourage MSDE, MHEC, colleges/universities, and school districts to seek additional external funds from state and federal sources, encourage colleges/universities and local school districts to continue budget reallocations, and for all stakeholders to begin the process of institutionalization of PDS sites and networks;

- given the uneven development of sites and networks across the state, as will as the growing pains associated with their development, "older" PDS sites should be encouraged to network with new and evolving PDS sites in a systematic fashion; and
- given that the development of PDS sites and networks will require consideration of certain personnel issues and roles/rewards structures, local school districts should be aware of the need for some permanence of key personnel engaged in PDS sites and networks, and colleges/universities need to modify reward structures to recognize PDS activities in evaluation and promotion of faculty.

Teacher Candidate Assessment Task Force -- A statewide task force with representatives from all P-16 stakeholders (faculty and administrators from P-12 schools; faculty and administrators from higher education institutions; and representatives from teacher associations, state department of education, and state council of higher education) met during 1995-96 and 1996-97 school years. Initially, a set of principles were developed and an assessment model was outlined. In September, 1997, the task force issued a report which included the set of principles and the assessment model as well as substantive recommendations for implementation. One overriding recommendations was the "full implementation of the MHEC-Redesign." This recommendation reflected the importance and pervasiveness of the MHEC-1995 document and gives the schools, colleges, and departments of education the responsibility for developing and institutionalizing performance based teacher candidate assessment systems. These systems must include a developmental portfolio review process and a performance based continuum for all initial teacher candidates. The performance expectations identified were either the standards outlined in the Maryland Essential Dimensions of Teaching (EDoT) or the principles established by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

In addition, the task force recommended the adoption of the Educational Testing Service (ETS) certification tests from the PRAXIS I and PRAXIS II series to replace the National Teacher Examination (NTE), and a multi-year strategy for setting, evaluating, and if necessary, raising the qualifying scores on the PRAXIS series. Other recommendations were:

- to align the teacher preparation programs in Maryland with other statewide P-12 performance assessment initiatives;
- to modify provisional certification to allow a maximum of two years for meeting the requirements for professional certification; and
- to recognize the importance of teacher induction and to require yearly performance assessments with beginning teacher support such as mentoring and peer coaching.

Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning in K-16 -- During the 1996-97 school year, the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning in K-16 was formed as an alliance between the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) , and the University System of Maryland (USM). The goal of the K-16 Partnership was to develop strategies for strengthening K-16 connections, standards, competencies, assess, professional development of educators, and community engagement in educational activities. The strength and authority of the K-16 partnership is vested in the individual authority and leadership of the heads of the three institutions (MSDE, MHEC, and USM) which share 1) a sense of urgency to increase K-16 student achievement, 2) a belief that bold educational leadership is required; and 3) a vision of the strength of collective strategies. The K-16 Partnership is supported by a Leadership Council consisting of corporate, civic, and public and private education leaders who advise and support the agenda to improve student achievement.

While there are several subcommittees of the K-16 Partnership, the recommendations of the Professional Development Design Team are most relevant to this presentation. The charge to this design team was to:

- analyze major state and national reform initiatives [MHEC-Redesign, Maryland Business Roundtable (MBRT) Report on Professional Development, and National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) Report];
- examine all issues affecting the quality of teacher education and professional development throughout K-16 education including reward systems and workload policies; and
- recommend areas of focus/change in the education and continued professional development of teachers.

The Professional Development Design Team made several recommendations that included rationale statements and implementation strategies. Many of the recommendations reinforced those contained in the MHEC-Redesign document, i.e., 1) redesigning and strengthening teacher education programs, 2) requiring an internship in professional development schools, 3) developing performance based certification strategies for initial teacher candidates and experienced teachers, and 4) developing and implementing continuous professional development programs for all educators. In addition, the Design Team also recommended that:

- general funds from the state budget should be requested annually by MSDE, MHEC, and USM to support the process of implementing the MHEC-Redeisgn;
- all colleges/universities involved in teacher education should be accredited by NCATE by the year 2004;
- faculty reward structures employed at the various colleges/universities should be reviewed by both MHEC and USM to ensure appropriate credit for participation in the K-16 initiative; and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- teacher loads and expectations for participating in the K-16 initiative should be established in contractual agreements at the local and state levels.

NCATE - Maryland State Partnership -- Maryland has been an NCATE Partnership state since 1992. The partnership allows colleges and universities in Maryland who elect to seek NCATE accreditation to have the state program approval processes and decision tied directly to the NCATE accreditation process. The state offers technical assistance to colleges and universities in the planning and preparation phases prior to the actual NCATE visit; this assistance includes preparation for meeting the preconditions, preparing the institutional report, and finalizing the arrangements for the actual visit. The state also provides NCATE-trained representatives to serve as state consultants during NCATE previsits and full-team visits.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future -- Maryland is one of twelve partnership states with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF). With the release of the Commission's report, "What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future," the State of Maryland recognized that a partnership would serve to advance the systematic reforms already underway in the state, while also contributing to the national agenda.

The Maryland systematic reform has three broad connecting components: 1) the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP), with its emphasis on challenging content and student performance standards; 2) new licensure regulations focused on initial and continuing certification of highly qualified teachers; and 3) the teacher education reform agenda, the MHEC-Redesign, focused on strengthening teacher education at the Maryland's colleges and universities. This third component and the K-16 initiative, mentioned above, have brought all of the stakeholders together in an unprecedented fashion. The partnership with NCTAF has provided the vehicle for continuing to engage these stakeholders at the state level and to participate in a national network of states similarly engaged.

Maryland's partnership with NCTAF is nested within the K-16 initiative, which has a leadership council co-chaired by the State Superintendent of Schools, the Secretary of Higher Education and the Chancellor of the University System of Maryland. Being a NCTAF partner state requires a state audit of policies relating to issues of teacher preparation, initial licensure, recruitment, employment, induction, advanced certification, licensure renewal, and continuous professional development, i.e., the full scope of the NCTAF recommendations. Participation also requires the state to develop a strategic plan for addressing the NCTAF. Such a plan is evolving from the work of the K-16 Council and the subcommittees.

State Task Force on Reading -- In 1997, the State Superintendent of Schools appointed a Task Force on Reading. The charge to this task force was to develop a

report on how children learn to read, how teachers and others help children learn to read, and what the educational community must do to improve children's reading performance. A major component of the task force's responsibilities has been to develop the performance expectations for new and experienced teachers in the area of Reading. These expectations are to be contained in four new courses at the early childhood / elementary level and two courses at the secondary level that will be required for initial teacher certification, and are to be demonstrated for experienced teachers pursing licensure renewal. Upon approval by the State Board, these expectations and the accompanying courses will become requirements within all teacher education programs and for the 47,000 practicing teachers in the state. These expectations are based upon contemporary and research-based approaches and strategies. At the early childhood / elementary level, the expectations for the four courses (12 semester hours) include the reading process and knowledge acquisition, methods for teaching reading, assessment of reading, and materials and literature to be used in the reading process. At the secondary level, the expectations for the two courses (6 semester hours) the reading process and knowledge acquisition, the assessment of reading, and the incorporation of reading into content areas through student-centered instruction with motivating students to read as being a critical element. At both levels, there are expectations for extensive field based experiences.

The State Superintendent has emphasized the urgency in moving forward on the recommendations of the task force. The task force is preparing drafts of a final report and will present the results to the State Board of Education and the Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board in the Spring/Summer of 1998.

Local College/University and School Implications

These interlocking initiatives are having a profound effect upon colleges and universities, school districts, state agencies, and the state legislature. At the colleges and universities, major curriculum / program revisions are underway. For example, at Towson University, the Departments of Early Childhood Education (ECED), Elementary Education (ELED), and Secondary Education (SCED) have submitted or will be submitting these revisions to college and university curriculum committees for approval. These revisions are responsive to the recommendations of both the MHEC-Redesign and the Task Force on Reading. These revisions will also be submitted to the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) as part of the ongoing program approval process.

At the colleges / universities and in the school districts, dialogue continues regarding ways to staff PDS sites within the growing networks of PDS sites. Joint positions between colleges / universities and the school districts, that are jointly funded, will require attention to internal reallocation of existing funds and to securing additional funds under the Maryland K-16 Partnership. At Towson University, joint positions have been established in each of the three departments (ECED, ELED, and SCED) with several different school districts; additional joint positions are presently

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

being created. As these new staffing patterns evolve, there will be a need to recognize the changing roles and expectations for these joint positions as well as for existing faculty at the colleges / universities and the school districts. Consideration will have to be given to the evolving role of P-12 faculty in the teacher preparation programs, including intern supervision and program revision. Faculty at colleges / universities will have to be engaged with P-12 faculty on school improvement teams and in the research / assessment / evaluation of the total learning environment of the PDS, including P-12 student achievement, intern performance, and the continuous professional development of all faculty at the school level and from the colleges / universities. It is imperative that these research / assessment / evaluation activities meet the scholarship expectations for the reward and evaluation structures of the colleges / universities.

As these interlocking initiatives continue to evolve, both the colleges / universities and the school districts must identify ways to reallocate existing funds for the expanding networks of PDS sites. The leadership within the colleges / universities and the school districts must also identify additional revenue sources. Most importantly, however, it will be imperative to establish a strategy for institutionalizing the funding of the networks by initially using reallocated funds and funds for new sources, but ultimately assuring the stability of these resources.

State implications

There are also major state implications from these interlocking initiatives. Of utmost importance is the state educational policy agenda. The MHEC-Redesign is "the" major state policy document for teacher education reform. The recommendations contained within this document are subject to the MSDE program approval process. Colleges / universities offering teacher education programs are accountable for these recommendations in order to retain program approval status for their programs. If the recommendations of the Reading Task Force are approved, the colleges / universities will also be responsible for those recommendations.

All of the interlocking initiatives have performance based assessments as the underlying theme; this theme is an outgrowth of the performance based assessments being implemented at the P-12 levels in the state. For both initial and advanced (or continuing) certification, the colleges / universities have been given the responsibility for developing performance assessments for their teacher candidates. However, the state has not provided the resources needed for development these assessments that are comparable to those resources provided to the P-12 assessments. It will be imperative for the colleges / universities to begin the process of developing these performance based assessments while working with MSDE and MHEC to leverage the needed resources as part of the K-16 Partnership. In addition, it will imperative for the colleges / universities to develop strategies for aggregating the performance based assessments for the state program approval process and for national accreditation.

The cornerstone for the MHEC-Redesign and for the subsequent interlocking initiatives are the professional development school sites and networks, and the learning that occurs within them. While there is a need to focus on the role of P-12 faculty in the teacher education programs, there is also a need for university faculty (from Education as well as Arts & Sciences) to become involved in different teaching and mentoring assignments on and off campus, and in multiple opportunities for scholarly activities at the individual sites and across the networks. Given the evolving role of university faculty, it will be imperative, at the state level, for the University System of Maryland (USM) and MHEC to examine faculty loads (including teaching loads) and faculty expectations for promotion, tenure and merit.

Finally, resources made available for the implementation of the MHEC-Redesign and the interlocking initiatives are critical to their success. Colleges / universities and school districts must continue to reallocate existing resources and identify new resources for implementing the various recommendations. But more importantly, the state must fundamentally reconsider the existing funding pattern for both P-12 education and higher education, and determine ways to fund the P-16 Partnership. These new ways for providing funding are needed for sustaining existing efforts, expanding the efforts, and institutionalizing the process of planing and implementing PDS sites and networks.